

the world in this enthusiastic technological advance.

In light of my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats, and my experience in the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I look forward to joining with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to encourage economic innovation brought by the bitcoins, but also to see to it that digital currencies will have strong standards that will thwart the exploration of this new economic function by terrorists and criminals and other evil forces in the world.

□ 1330

So I look forward to working with my colleagues. I think this is a bipartisan issue. I won't try to make it sound sinister at all, because this is something we can work on, and we must keep America always in the forefront of technological development.

We know with each step forward in technology, there is a potential harm that can be done, but we need to make sure that is taken into consideration, while at the same time that we do not thwart Americans from using the ultimate technologies of the day to secure prosperity and secure freedom and to secure our national security with these new technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much my friend from California, DANA ROHRBACHER, making the point that he did.

There is nothing either sinister, wrong, criminal, improper when someone is engaged in an election or when someone is not engaged in an election, if offered information that may be helpful, whatever the source. Unless it is a known criminal that is going to advise someone about some potential crime, there is normally nothing wrong with seeking or even getting that information.

I doubt there is anybody on this House floor, when offered information from a source about an opponent in a campaign, didn't at least take some action to see if there was anything legitimate to it.

So it is just amazing, when we know that there is certainly probable cause to believe crimes have been committed during the Obama administration, yet we got nothing in the way of support in investigating the probable cause of real legitimate crimes; not those for which there is no known criminal statute that would be applicable or that may have been violated, but simply, you know, there may be times when it is bad taste.

But the villainization of Donald Trump, Jr., for inquiring of someone

that Loretta Lynch, as Attorney General for President Obama, specifically and personally stepped in to ensure could be in this country, it is just incredible how much is being made of Donald Trump, Jr., meeting with somebody that Attorney General Lynch pulled all kinds of strings to get her in and keep her in the country.

And then when you see that picture of this same person sitting right behind the Obama Ambassador to Russia, Ambassador McFaul, and you know at these hearings, especially an appointed and confirmed official like an ambassador, they don't want somebody directly behind them who is not supportive and not capable of reaching up and handing them a note with information that may be helpful and them answering a question.

We have had countless hearings, and I have seen it done countless times. You want somebody behind you that can help provide answers to questions that you may not can answer without their help.

So there she is, this person that these same friends who pulled all kinds of strings to get her in this country. They are all upset that she ever talked to Donald Trump, Jr., and he has—I admire the fact that he immediately saw that this was a worthless meeting and walked away from it. So pretty amazing. It was good judgment to walk away from it, once he found out what she was about.

I wish that President Obama, Loretta Lynch, and Hillary Clinton had as good a judgment in their meetings with people instead of telling our enemy—and I do consider the man with whom President Obama was meeting an enemy. He was not a friend of the United States.

And what does President Obama do when he doesn't think the microphone can pick him up?

He says: Tell Vladimir Putin—President Obama's close buddy—tell Vladimir, my buddy, that I have a lot more flexibility once I am past this election.

"Okay. Yeah. I will pass that on. Dah, dah, I will pass that on."

Clear intent; there is no mistaking. The intent is: I will be able to give away more of America's defenses the way I canceled our missile defense system in Poland once I am reelected because then I don't care. I won't be running. I can't be defeated in another election. So I will be able to give away a lot more of America's defenses.

And what did our friends—who are now so upset about Donald Trump meeting with a Russian lawyer, finding out she was not worth meeting with and leaving—do back then?

Nothing. They defended President Trump's actions either vocally or by their silence while we were raising questions.

I can't end this week without expressing my grave disappointment with Congress over a specific detail of the National Defense Authorization Act. There are a number of things in there that bother me that I think are big

mistakes and that I don't think we should be doing. I think we are wasting money, but compromises have to be made. We are making a form of sausage called "laws," so we have got to compromise on some things.

But there are some things that are so important that there cannot be a compromise. It is too important. It will result in lives being saved or lives being lost, depending on what we do here in Congress.

So our friend, Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER, realized before I did that the law, as would be in the National Defense Authorization Act, with all the compromises that had to be made under the great leadership—and I am not being sarcastic—of Congressman MAC THORNBERRY—did a masterful job handling all the problems that arose—but the law of the NDAA was and will be, under this new law, such that President Obama and his administration would say, the way it is worded, the way it is, authorizes us to decide that an appropriate use of this very limited more and more precious money for our military to defend us can and should be used whenever someone requests a sex change operation.

The reports are that, with the hormonal treatment, it can be around \$130,000 or so per person. Military commanders advise that they have been told: If you have a military member under your command that asks for a sex change operation and you say something like "have you really thought this through?" or they say something like "why don't you talk to a counselor?" or "let's talk about this" or "you give it some more thought," those are career-ending statements that that commander would have made; that if someone requests a sex change operation, you don't ask questions, you don't refer them to counseling, you don't suggest that they give it more thought. You just sign them up.

Now, the problem there, too, is that apparently they are advised that they have about 2 years minimum that this servicemember will be out of commission, cannot be deployed, you can't be sending them anywhere because you have months of hormonal treatment leading up to the sex change surgery. And then even if there are no complications, the followup and the rehab is quite significant. So you better count on at least a couple of years minimum where that servicemember, that military member cannot be sent anywhere, cannot be ordered deployed. They are useless in defense of our country as far as filling the immediate needs of the military, and that is astounding.

Now, potentially, some might submit that we have come to find out about maybe the greatest political lobbying by any group of our medical practitioners. And those who compile the diagnostic statistic manual, referred to as DSM—we have had I, II, III, IV, V—each time, they have been subjected to political lobbying because they didn't

want people who were thinking about a sex change operation—and even though their chromosomes would not change—still indicating they are male or female, they wanted to have surgery to change. That was considered to be a very serious illness, psychiatric illness.

But with a lot of lobbying, it eventually got downgraded, and the most recent downgrading in the DSM is to something called a “dysphoria.” It went from “disorder” to “dysphoria.”

But dysphoria, if you look it up, it still is—well, one psychiatrist just said it means confusion, basically. If you have got transgender dysphoria, you are confused. It is the opposite of euphoria. You are not well, you are not happy, you have got behavioral problems because you are not happy with your gender.

Well, for most of our country's history, we understood that, in our military, it is not to be a societal experiment. We want people who can fight, hopefully not to their death, but to the enemy's death to stop those who would kill us or take our freedom.

And it is heartbreaking that—when the amendment came to the floor last night for a vote to prevent any of that precious money that is going to save the lives of our military members, the amendment lost by five votes, 214-209. In other words, if three people had changed their vote, that amendment passes, and no money could be used out of that precious money they need for bulletproof vests, they need for up-armored vehicles to save their lives when an IED hits them, all of these things that are so important to our military.

□ 1345

We are told to account for \$3.5 to \$3.9 billion over 10 years they are projecting to be spent, but that, of course, means that is before word gets out that if you want a sex change operation, if you can get through basic training—I am not sure about that, you may not have to get through basic—but if you can join the military and demand a sex change operation, then you are not deployable. They can't send you to combat for at least 2 years.

We will pay you as a military member. We will provide you, free, the hormonal treatments. We will take that money that could save another member's life and we will spend that on this expensive surgery to change your organs, maybe cut them off or add some, and then we will spend more of that money that could save other military members' lives and spend it on your follow-up and your rehab, all while you can't help them because you are going through this transition.

This is a difficult time, and it breaks my heart. And it is not a civilization-ending thing that happened last night, but when the book one day is written about the rise and fall of what so far has been the most free and greatest nation in the history of mankind, this would be something listed as a symptom of why this country lost the next

great war, because they were more concerned about playing societal experiments than they were with defending their lives and their freedom.

I see my friend, as good a friend as I have here in Washington. I yield to my friend, STEVE KING.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. And I have no better friend in this city either—or this country, for that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I am just called to come to this floor to add a few words to the topic that the gentleman from Texas has courageously brought forward and so few others would want to even speak to: the societal experiment that is going on in our military, the greatest military in the history of the world.

When the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) talks about how history will be written one day, this isn't a civilization killer, but it is an indication of a civilization killer. I think of the circumstances in a little bit older history, back in the 16th century and the 17th century when the Ottoman Empire and the Muslim armies were sweeping across the countryside, and whoever they captured, they pressed into slavery.

And when they pressed them into slavery, they wanted to have their crack troops—they were called Janissaries, and there were other troops too, as well. But what they did in order to keep them from reproducing was that they did reassignment surgery on those slaves that they captured, that they had put into their Janissary troops, and that reassignment surgery was they took them from being a virile, reproductive male into being a eunuch.

Now, they were suitable to work in the harem, but they found out when they put them out in the field to do battle against the enemy that they didn't have the testosterone to take on the fight. And so over a period of time, a generation or two, they finally realized: I guess we are going to have to stop turning these men into eunuchs if we are going to have them as a fighting machine. That is the Janissaries.

And the old history through that is replete with narrative after narrative of them taking out the knife and actually cutting the flesh off of these anatomically complete men. Some would die from that and some would live, but none of them had the will to fight. And so they decided that they were going to keep anatomically complete men, men that were producing testosterone, in their crack Janissary troops, where they fought well.

That is a lesson of the military, the Ottoman military from 200, 300, 400 years ago. And today we are here thinking somehow we are going to make the military better by letting people line up at the recruitment center who have planned that they want to do sexual reassignment surgery, know that it is expensive, and believe: I can just get into any branch of the United

States services—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, maybe become a Navy SEAL—and then submit to sexual reassignment surgery and go from a man to a woman.

By the way, it doesn't look like there are going to be any women becoming men after they go through SEAL training. I don't think that is going to happen, at least currently.

But there is no way that this enhances the capabilities of our military. There is no way it enhances the morale of our military, and you will never see a platoon that is made up by all of the folks that are likely to line up to sign up into our military.

This policy clearly enacted, clearly advertised, is a neon sign for people who want to have sexual reassignment surgery. They will line up at their recruiter's office and they will go into the military, and the military will be saying: You know, we had to turn this person away because they were too heavy, and this one had flat feet, and this one had a bad eye, and this one had a congenital defect of one kind or another, but if they don't have those and they want sexual reassignment surgery, we will cut them up and remake them into something different, to the tune of \$3.5 or \$3.9 billion over a 10-year period of time, and put them off in the recovery room for 2 years before we can put them to work and use them.

And, by the way, they are likely then to be discharged to come back into society if their only purpose was to get the free surgery.

And can you imagine someone who has now gone into Walter Reed Hospital, taken up a bed in Walter Reed Hospital, maybe a roommate with someone who was hit by an IED, someone who lost a couple of legs, amputated in the dangerous, dangerous service of the freedoms of our country, can you imagine those two beds, side by side, and one of them missing a couple of legs, or an arm, or an arm and a leg, or two arms, and the other one saying, “Well, I just came in for sexual reassignment surgery”?

I won't say the next thing that is in my mind. I think the public understands the image of what this is.

This is one of the most appallingly stupid things I have ever seen the United States Congress do, and it has got some competition, but I don't even know what is second, it is so bad. And the long-term thinking of this, the implications of this are awful, Mr. Speaker. We need to reverse this somehow.

I would add, also, that Bob Gates, the former Secretary of Defense, testified before the United States Congress that we had an obesity problem with our young people in America that is a national security risk, it is a national security concern, and we ought to be adopting Michelle Obama's Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act that cut the calories down on these kids, because we didn't have enough of them that were available to meet the physical standards to get into the military, and it

was a national security risk. Those were his exact words, “a national security risk.”

Well, if we can put the kids on a diet in school because it is a national security risk for getting people to meet the weight standards of our military, isn't this a national security risk when you have all of these resources that are redirected from F-35s and pension plans and a raise for our military and housing on our bases, and the list goes on and on, redirect those resources to sexual reassignment surgery and then have them mustered out of the service as soon as they get what they went into the service for in the first place? This is idiocy on the part of the United States Congress.

I salute the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for introducing this amendment. I had a similar amendment that was turned down in the Rules Committee. But this is something this Congress made a significant error on. Twenty-four Republicans and every single Democrat voted against this.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing up the topic, and I would be happy to yield back to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments.

In fact, some people sometimes think that we exaggerate, but my very good friend from Iowa and I have stood there on the mountaintop outside of Vienna where Western civilization stood there in the gap, and it was all at risk. The odds were that Western civilization was going to end with the fall of Vienna. If the radical Islamic group that had taken so much of the territory already, if Vienna fell, then the rest of Europe would fall. There would be no stopping this radical Islamic movement through Europe, and there is a good chance we are not even here in this fashion today.

I thought about that and my friend and I standing up there getting a briefing from an individual that knew the history so well, that this is where one group was, this is where the siege was, that is where the Polish group brought cannons, and no one in the Islamic group thought it was possible to get cannons up there.

I thought about that and reflected on that as President Trump was speaking in Warsaw, Poland, and it was clear how desirous the Polish people have always been for freedom: Yes, you can practice what religion you want to, but don't come try to take over our country and tell us we can't pursue Christianity.

I did not realize until President Trump gave that speech that there in Warsaw, when Pope John Paul II, came, that they were screaming “We want God” as a group—amazing.

So as I recall, though, it was a Polish prince or king that came down, King Jan Sobieski who came to the aid of the Viennese people. They were under siege. They were going to be defeated.

It meant the fall of Western civilization; perhaps we headed into a new Dark Ages. And this Polish king comes down, determined, gets cannon up on this mountaintop that no one who was in the 2 years of seeking a sex change operation and sex reassignment, as they call it, could possibly help do during that 2-year period. They got cannons up the mountain in position to help stop the obliteration there of the Western-civilized Vienna, to stop the fall of that radical Islamic empire from taking over and destroying Western civilization, making slaves of all of those whom they overtook.

And some, of course, in their party believed that if an individual refused to become a Muslim, they should be killed. Others believed in the more humane treatment that, no, you make them slaves, and as long as they keep paying their tax, which is really an admittance that there is no God greater than the Islamic God, as long as they are willing to subjugate themselves and worship at the altar by paying that fee to show that they were subservient to the Islamic God, then they could be allowed to live.

Those were two problems back in that day: Do we let the people live if they won't become Muslim, or do we just go ahead and kill them? And many humane thinkers thought: Well, no. As long as they will submit to our god, pay the tax to show they are submitting to our god; and Christianity's God, they have got to forget talking about that or they do need to be killed. Just pay the tax and they can go about still living.

If Vienna doesn't stand, if it falls, as was anticipated, we are done.

And I can assure my friends here in the House that there was no one who was out there defeating the radical Islamic desire to wipe out Western civilization who had undergone a sex change operation in the prior 2 years.

This is a risky time in our history. As others have pointed out, no matter what societal experimentations people want to undertake, what type of lifestyles people want to undertake, the military is intended to protect our freedom so that we can pursue these things.

And I know President Obama was fond of saying: Gee, Guantanamo is a greater recruiting tool. But as I have talked to Muslim friends—yes, I do have them around the world. As I have talked to Muslim friends in other parts of the world, whether Afghanistan, Egypt, other parts of the Middle East, North Africa, they say: You have got to understand, some of the things you do in the United States make for incredible recruiting posters for radicals in our Muslim faith.

When it is advertised that the United States Congress is in favor of taking men and surgically making them into women with the money that they would use to protect the Nation otherwise, or taking women and doing surgery to make them men, the United

States Congress would rather spend that money on that surgery than defeating radical Islam, then it is an advertising, just a bonanza for the radical Islamists.

My Muslim friends tell me, they then agree, the recruits: You are right. If that is how stupid they are, their society has no right to remain on the Earth. We need to take them out. They are too stupid.

A disappointing night last night and a disappointing week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a medical appointment.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 17, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

JIMMY GOMEZ

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1967. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1968. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1969. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Captain William S. Dillon, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1970. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lake Michigan, Whiting, Indiana [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0195] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 13, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.